

*Amendment of 8/22/03, Appl'n. 09/708,658, GAU 3724*

**REMARKS**

[3] Claims 1-3 were rejected over Jones '337 in view of Carr. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(1) The Examiner points to Jones' disclosure of ion bombardment etching and asserts that Carr also discloses ion bombardment etching. The Applicant disagrees because Carr discloses etching in a dilute HF bath, or plasma assisted chemical etching (PACE), for the purpose of exposing sub-surface defects. These etches are disclosed on the second and third text pages. No disclosure of etching by ion bombardment is seen by the Applicant, and the Examiner is requested to provide a citation if he maintains that Carr also discloses ion bombardment etching.

(2) The chemical processes used by Carr actually *increase* the roughness; this is shown by Table I on the sixth text page. "A sharp increase in roughness is noted as the surface is etched from 0 to 80 nm," writes Carr just above Table I, and on the following page adds, "Further etching causes additional roughening." Since Jones is sharpening a blade with its ion bombardment etching, not testing like Carr, and the person of ordinary skill would not have substituted Carr's chemical process that increases the surface roughness and therefore decreases sharpness.

It is noted that Jones teaches chemical etching as a step preliminary to ion bombardment. Chemical etching is disclosed starting at column 2, line 44. Jones states at column 3, line 23, that "A combination of abrasive methods and

*Amendment of 8/22/03, Appl'n. 09/708,658, GAU 3724*

chemical methods may be used to form the desired *shape* of cutting edge" (emphasis added), and at column 3, line 45, explains, "One of the above described methods may be used to form the desired finished cutting edge. However, a final shaping and finishing can be provided, for example, by ion bombardment." Jones teaches away from chemical etching as a final step in sharpening a blade.

(3) Carr is from the area of testing optical surfaces and has no disclosed relationship to blades, and the Applicant sees no teaching about optical surfaces in Jones. It is the Applicant, not Jones or Carr, who relates optical surfaces and blades. It is the Applicant, not the person of ordinary skill, who saw the relationship.

(4) The Examiner points out the surface roughnesses disclosed in Table II on the last page of Carr. With respect, this data relates to diamond-turned optical surfaces (see preceding page) which have been etched by Carr's chemical methods. There is no relationship to ion bombardment, or the blade of Jones. It is noted that Table II, like Table I, also discloses that Carr's processes increase the roughness.

(5) Claim 1 now recites that the plate is of harder material than the substrate. Carr discloses no plating material, while Jones uses alumina for the substrate and discloses a coating of chromium on the alumina at column 5, line 12, as noted by the Examiner. But chromium is not harder than alumina, and there is no anticipation of the new feature. The Examiner is referred to the

*Amendment of 8/22/03, Appl'n. 09/708,658, GAU 3724*

attached photocopies from a dictionary and the Handbook of Chemistry and Physics.

Alumina is another name for corundum or aluminum oxide (dictionary). Alumina defines the hardness of 9 on the Mohs scale of hardness, and the Mohs hardness of chromium is 9.0 (handbook), exactly the same as the alumina substrate. On the Knoop scale of hardness, the hardness of alumina is 2100 and the hardness of chromium is 935 (handbook). Thus on one hardness scale there is no difference in hardness, while on the other scale the substrate is more than twice as hard as the coating.

As there is no disclosure of the feature now claimed in either reference, no combination would reach the claims even if the combination were obvious (not admitted).

The other coatings disclosed by Jones, such as polymer, are not harder than the alumina substrate. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization of polymer as "hard" and requests a citation in support if the Examiner is to maintain that polymer might be harder than alumina.

(6) Claim 1 as amended recites the plate extending to the cutting edge on a single side of the blade. This is not disclosed by Jones, which presents the formation and sharpening of the blade as steps preliminary to coating. The Applicant sees no disclosure of the coatings being formed on a single side of the blade. Jones says that the coatings are applied "in the vicinity of the cutting edge" (column 5, line 9), but that does not imply the Applicant's feature.

*Amendment of 8/22/03, Appl'n. 09/708,658, GAU 3724*

(7) The Applicant sees no disclosure of the subject matter of claim 2, and the Examiner has not pointed out where in the references that subject matter might be.

[4] Claim 4 was rejected over Jones '337 in view of Carr and Lane. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Applicant assumes that the Examiner meant Lane et al. '379, not Lane '329.

Lane '379 teaches glass for a coating, not for a substrate, and therefore does not anticipate claim 4. It is noted that Lane et al. teaches against the new feature of claim 1, that the plate extends to the cutting edge on a single side of the blade.

[5] Claim 5 was rejected over Jones '337 in view of Carr and Lane. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds above relating to the base claim, and on the further grounds that Jones discloses polymer is for lubricity, and substituting ceramic for the polymer would not improve lubricity.

[6] Claim 6 was rejected over Jones '337 in view of Carr and Fischbein '342. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds above relating to the base claim, and on the further grounds that the thickness of a polymer layer is immaterial to any hard layer such as a chromium layer, so there is no teaching toward the Applicant's claims.

*Amendment of 8/22/03, Appl'n. 09/708,658, GAU 3724*

Allowance of all claims under consideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

*Nick Bromer*

Nick Bromer  
[Registration No. 33,478]  
(717) 426-1664, voice and fax

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 22 2003

GROUP 3700

OFFICIAL

Address: 402 Stackstown Road  
Marietta, PA 17547

Attachment (**FOUR PAGES**): Pages from dictionary and handbook.

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (703) 872-9302) on August 22, 2002.*

*Nick Bromer (reg. no. 33,478)*

Signature Nick Bromer

## trical

**ALTIMETER**, n., the science or measuring of altitudes. [*ALTI-* + *METR-* + *ETER*] —*al-ti-me-tric* (əl'tē-mē-trēk), adj. —*al-ti-me-tric-al*

(əl'tē-mē-trēk' mōr'), n., *Music*. *High* —*n.*, *in altissimo*, in the second treble staff. [*< L: 16th, highest, equiv. to *altissimo superius**] *suff(x)*

**ALTO**, (əl'tō), n., 1. the height above the earth's surface or in the extent or distance upward; height: *The trees are not of great altitude*. 2. *Astron*, the distance of a heavenly body above the horizon, a perpendicular distance from the vertex, the side opposite the vertex. 3. the line or a figure perpendicular to the base, altitude, a high point or region: *mountain* high or exalted position, rank, etc. [*< L: v. to *altus* high + -tō*] *height* —*Ant.*, *depth*. *Ant.*, *depth*.

**AL**, an adjustable sundial utilising the sun, at a given latitude and time of year, telling the time. *Cf. direction dial*.

**ALTO**, (əl'tō), adj., relating height. [*< L: *altitudin* (a. of *altitudine*)*] *t.*

**ALTO**, pl., -*tos*, adj., *Music*. —n. 1. the lowest contralto. 2. the highest male voice; 3. a singer with such a voice. 4. a musical voice, 5. the second highest of the mixed vocal chorus, or the voices or parts. 6. the second highest instrument musical instruments, as the viola in the violin family. —adj., pertaining to, or having the tonal range of a musical instrument second highest in musical instruments; also *saxophone*. [*< L: *altus* (high)*] *high*

**ALTO-CLESTYXUS**, *Music*. A sign locating middle C on the bass staff. Also called *viola clef*. See *illus*.

**ALTO-CLOUD**, (əl'tō kydō/mys lōd), n., pl., -*lus*, *ind*, of a class characterized by globular in layers or patches, the individual larger and darker than those of stratuscumulus; of medium 8000-30,000 feet. [*ALTO-* + *CUMULUS*]

**ALTO-CUMULUS**, pl., *altocumulus castanotus*, an altocumulus cloud having its like a crenelated tower. Also, *altocumulus castanotus*.

**ALTO-CUMULUS**, pl., *altocumulus floccus*, a cumulus cloud having its summit in the cumuliform tufts or masses.

**ALTO-CLOUD**, pl., *altocumulus lentulus*, an altocumulus cloud having at its outlined lenticular shapes and somewhat iridescence.

**ALTO-CLOUD**, pl., *altocumulus Marmor*, an altocumulus cloud consisting of more horizontal layers.

**ALTOGETHER**, adv., 1. wholly; entirely; 2. with all or everything included; *all together* to twenty dollars. 3. with no consideration, for the whole. *All together*, *entirely*. 4. In all together. *Informal*: *Phrases rung she had just stepped out of the in the altogether*. [*var. of ME altogether*, *ME*] —*al-to-geth'er-ness*, n.

**ALTOGETHERLY**, adv., *Archaic*. *Entirely* (an altogether confused all together, an adjective phrase, up) (*They were all together in the kitchen*, *altogetherly*).

**ALTON**, n., 1. a city in SW Illinois. 43,047 (1960). *o name*.

**ALTON**, n., a metropolitan district of Germany; formerly an independent city.

**ALTONA**, n., a city in central Pennsylvania.

a town in NW Georgia. 2526 (1960).

**ALTO-SILO**, pl., n., pl., -*vos*. See *high altitude*.

**ALTO-SILVER**, (əl'tō sīl'ver), n., pl., *alti-sil-ler-ēz*, *z*. *Jewelry*, *the high relief*.

**ALTO-STRETCH**, n., pl., -*tes*. *Material*, as characterized by a generally uniform layer, lighter in color than rimboustrosus a circostrosus; of medium altitude, about st. [*ALTO-* + *STRETCH*]

**ALTO-STRETCH**, adj., *Ornith*, helpful at hatching parental care for a period of time. *Cf.* *ALTO-STRETCH*, *L: *altrist* (a. of *altrix*)*

**ALTO-STRETCH**, iv, to al-to-stretch (see *ALSTRETCH*) + -*tricity*- + -*ency* (-*AL*).

**ALTO-STRETCH**, n., the principle or practice concern for or devotion to the welfare of to system. [*< F: *altruisme* (T: *altruist* (L: *altrist*) + F: *isme* -ism)*

**ALTO-STRETCH**, n., a person unselfishly concerned to the welfare of others (opposed to formation from *ALTRISTE*)

**ALTO-STRETCH**, adj., unselfishly concerned to the welfare of others (opposed to *egoism*) + -*erity* —*al-tru-is-tis-ty*, adv., *Mo generous, philanthropic; disinterested*,

*generous*, *philanthropic; disinterested*,

*generous*, *phil*

THE  
RANDOM  
HOUSE  
DICTIONARY  
of the  
ENGLISH  
LANGUAGE

JESS STEIN  
Editor in Chief

LAURENCE URDANG  
Managing Editor



STYLING HIGHLIGHTS ON DETAILS

(Selected from Statistical Tables.)

Given in pounds per square inch. The values can be considered only as approximants.

HARDNESS (Continued)

Metal	Tensile Strength in lbs. per sq. in.
Aluminum wire.....	30000-40000
Bronze wire.....	50000-160000
Bronze wire, phosphor, hard drawn.....	110000-140000
Bronze wire, silicon, hard drawn.....	95000-115000
Bronze,.....	60000-75000
Cobalt, cast.....	55000
Copper wire, hard drawn.....	60000-70000
German silver.....	40000-50000
Gold wire.....	20000
Iron, cast.....	13000-35000
Iron wire, hard drawn.....	80000-120000
Iron wire, sprung.....	50000-60000
Lead, cast or drawn.....	2000-3000
Magnesium, hard drawn.....	52000
Nickel metal, cold drawn.....	80000-100000
Nickel, hard drawn.....	150000
Palladium.....	50000
Phosphorus wire.....	22000
Ruthenium wire.....	40000-350000
Silver wire.....	450000
Steel wire, maximum, specially treated nickel steel.....	250000
Steel, piano wire, 0.032 in., dia.m.....	350000-387000
Steel, piano wire, 0.031 in., dia.m.....	150000
Tantalum.....	4000-5000
Tungsten, cast or drawn.....	500000
Zinc, cast.....	7000-13000
Zinc, drawn.....	250000-300000

卷之三

Moss' Scale of Hardness	To
4 Fluorite	8
5 Apatite	9
6 Feldspar	10

Muns' Table	1 Rock salt or gypsum	2 Calcite	3	4 Fluorite	5 Topaz	6 Corundum	7 Diamond	8 Quartz	9 Corundum	10 Diamond
Apophyllite	.....	6-7	Schist	.....	1.5	.....	.....	3	1.5	.....
Asbestos	.....	1.7	Calcium	.....	10.0	.....	.....	.....	10.0	.....
Alum.	.....	2-2.5	Carbonatium	.....	9-10	.....	.....	.....	9-10	.....
Aluminum	.....	2-2.5	Cesium	.....	0.2	.....	.....	.....	0.2	.....
Ammonium	.....	2-2.5	Chromium	.....	9.0	.....	.....	.....	9.0	.....
Ammonium	.....	2-2.5	Copper	.....	2.5	.....	.....	.....	2.5	.....
Ammeter	.....	7.5	Cordierite	.....	9	.....	.....	.....	9	.....
Andalusite	.....	7.5	Diamond	.....	10	.....	.....	.....	10	.....
Andradite	.....	3.0-3.5	Diamantocrystarh.	.....	1-1.5	.....	.....	.....	1-1.5	.....
Andradite	.....	3.0-3.5	Dolomite	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	3	.....
Andromecite	.....	3.5	Emery	.....	7-8	.....	.....	.....	7-8	.....
Annularite	.....	3.5	Feldspar	.....	6	.....	.....	.....	6	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Flint	.....	7	.....	.....	.....	7	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Fluorite	.....	4.5	.....	.....	.....	4.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Gallium	.....	2.5	.....	.....	.....	2.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Garnet	.....	1.5	.....	.....	.....	1.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Glass	.....	6.5-7	.....	.....	.....	6.5-7	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Gold	.....	5.5	.....	.....	.....	5.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Gypsum	.....	2.5	.....	.....	.....	2.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Hematite	.....	0.5-1	.....	.....	.....	0.5-1	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Hornblende	.....	1.5	.....	.....	.....	1.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Quartz	.....	6.5	.....	.....	.....	6.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Spinel	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Titanite	.....	1.5	.....	.....	.....	1.5	.....
Argonite	.....	3.5	Zircon	.....	5.5	.....	.....	.....	5.5	.....

23

### COMPARISON OF HARDNESS VALUES OF VARIOUS MATERIALS ON MOHS AND KNOOP SCALES.

Compiled by Laurent S. Venter

Substance	Formula	Molar value	Knoop values
Titanium	$TiO_2$	1	33
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	2	37
Titanium nitride	$TiN$	3	60
Titanium boride	$TiB$	4	119
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	5	125
Titanium nitride	$TiN$	6	162
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	7	163
Titanium nitride	$TiN$	8	270
Glass (soft line)		9	420
Fischer's paraffin		10	557
Quartz	$SiO_2$	11	591
Aluminia	$Al_2O_3$	12	580
Corundum	$Al_2O_3$	13	820
Alumina	$Al_2O_3$	14	935
Boron	$B_2O_3$	15	1160
Alumina	$Al_2O_3$	16	1250
Alumina carbide alloy	$(Al_2O_3)FeO-3SiO_2$	17	1340
Alumina boride	$WC$	18	1380
Titanium nitride	$TiN$	19	1550
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	20	1800
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	21	1850
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	22	2000
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	23	2100
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	24	2100
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	25	2270
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	26	2480
Titanium carbide	$TiC$	27	2550

Acknowledgment is made to N. W. Thibault, Norton Company, Worcester, Massachusetts, for many of Knoop hardness values. Cf. R. S. Becker, "A Study of Ceramics for Nuclear Reactors," *Nucleonics*, Vol. 7, No. 4, Table I, pp. 8-9 (Oct. 1950). V. F. Johnson.

HANDBOOK  
OF  
CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS

A READY-REFERENCE BOOK OF  
CHEMICAL AND PHYSICAL DATA  
FORTY-FOURTH EDITION

EDITOR IN CHIEF

CHARLES D. HODGMAN, M.S.  
*Professor Emeritus, Case Institute of Technology*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR IN CHARGE OF CHEMISTRY

ROBERT C. WEAST, Ph.D.  
*Professor of Chemistry at Case Institute of Technology*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR IN CHARGE OF PHYSICS

ROBERT S. SHANKLAND, Ph.D.  
*Associate Professor of Physics  
at Case Institute of Technology*

ASSOCIATE EDITOR IN CHARGE OF MATHEMATICS

SAMUEL M. SELBY, Ph.D.  
*Chairman, Mathematics Department and University of Akron*

IN COLLABORATION WITH A LARGE NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL  
CHEMISTS AND PHYSICISTS WHOSE AWARENESS IS ACKNOWLEDG-  
EDGED IN THE LARGEST GENERAL COLLABORATIVE AND IN CON-  
nection with THE PARTICULAR TABLES OR SECTIONS INVOLVED.

PUBLISHED BY

THE CHEMICAL RUBBER PUBLISHING CO.  
2310 Superior Ave. N. E. Cleveland, Ohio  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA